

RECEIVED

9 August 1999

AUG 12 1999

EIS000002

Wendy R. Dixon, EIS  
Project Manager, Yucca Mt. Site  
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
P.O. Box 30307 Mail Stop 010  
North Las Vegas NV 89036-0307

We are opposed to Yucca Mountain as a Nuclear Waste repository and we are also opposed to the DOE report as released on Friday, August 6, 1999.

COMMENTS

1. Nevada has no nuclear reactors, thus it has produced no nuclear waste. Why should this state be made to store all the nuclear waste of other states and countries and jeopardize its citizens' health when it has not been involved in producing radioactive energy? STATES WHO PRODUCE NUCLEAR WASTE SHOULD FIND WAYS TO DISPOSE THEIR NUCLEAR GARBAGE IN THEIR OWN STATES.

2. Nevada has a Great Basin, that is, it is a land of interior drainage. Nevada had a violent geologic metamorphosis, millions of years ago, undergoing continual erosion for a long period. It experienced earth movements which have been continual and vigorous to this day in the interiors of its volcanic mountains. As a result, most of the mountain ranges in the Great Basin are bounded by faults on either one side or on both sides of the mountains. During the period of the geologic metamorphosis drainage to the prehistoric seas was disrupted, causing diversion of the streams into the interior basins and setting the basic structure for water to drain into the interior of the faults and crevices of the volcanic mountains. To place canisters or tanks that store nuclear waste into such volcanic mountains, that could cause these containers to break or leak, is placing the entire interior water supply of the state at great risk for nuclear contamination. The DOE has not addressed this issue sufficiently.

3. Transporting nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain puts the entire country at risk for exposure to nuclear radioactive material if there are any spills. And there will be accidents. There have already been accidents on the highways. DOE has not written about routes of transportation. Routes must be made public!

4. Other methods for disposing of nuclear waste must be studied and used. Senator Domenici, N.M. has proposed a bill that creates an Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research within the DOE. The proposed office would develop demonstration programs for treating, recycling, and disposal of high level nuclear waste from commercial power reactors and defense activities. Transmutation may become a high-tech solution to the high-level radioactive waste problem. Let us find alternate solutions, even though they take money and time, rather than insisting on only one solution, bury it in Yucca

5 continued Mountain, for high-level nuclear waste left from power generators and weapons work.-

6 5. DOE should review the report just released about unsuspecting workers in Paducah, KY. who were exposed to high levels of radioactive dust. The Federal Government was sure that the workers would not be containminated and told them so. But it was a flawed government experiment. Don't let Yucca Mountain be a flawed government experiment just because Nuclear Lobbyists are pushing Congress to put nuclear waste in Yucca Mountain.

7 In conclusion we are against the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain in Nevada  
8 for we fear for the health of our citizens, particularly children. We are opposed to the DOE report as released on Friday 6, 1999 because DOE has not done sufficient studies and has not considered alternatives to Yucca Mountain.

  
Gay and Robert Goldstein

10332 Villa Ridge Dr  
Las Vegas NV 89134-7416

(702) 228-8388  
[r.g.goldstein@worldnet.att.net](mailto:r.g.goldstein@worldnet.att.net)